

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. II, NUMBER 40

NOVEMBER 8, 1954



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

On Adlai's Accusing Ike of Marxism

In the closing days of the campaign, a real issue was touched upon. This was when Stevenson accused Eisenhower of affirming that our prosperity "has been achieved in the past only at the price of war and bloodshed" and thereby of echoing "standard Communist propaganda." This effort to picture the President himself as a security risk was the high point of a campaign in which Republicans and Democrats accused each other of being Communists, an accusation unfair to all three.

Now Eisenhower, who probably has trouble distinguishing Karl from Harpo, did not exactly say what Stevenson charged. The President had said in Cleveland the night before that unemployment today was far less than in 1949 and 1950 and one-third what it was in 1940. He added that those who got work in 1950 and 1940 "got it only when we went to war and they went either into uniform or into war plants." And he asked, "Now do we want war in order to solve our economic difficulties?" Though loaded and leading, it was a good question.

It would be ignoring the giant accomplishments of American capitalism in mass production and mass distribution to picture it as a vampire, capable only of living on blood. But it is a fact that the New Deal had failed to end mass unemployment when the Second World War came along, that a postwar recession was precariously ebbing when the Korean war broke out, and that a new recession began once the Korean fighting ended.

Stevenson's Silly Season

It was a silly bit of question-begging for Stevenson to orate in reply, "let me say to our friends and our enemies beyond the seas that no one who sincerely believes in free capitalism can believe that we can only be prosperous when at war." This was yodelling, not discussion. Few people anywhere any longer believe in "free capitalism"; most people have come around to the view that the market must be managed by private or public means or both if it is to operate efficiently. How manage it so that the pump can be primed peacefully? That is the question.

What are we going to do if world tension dies down? In the calendar year 1953, one dollar out of every five spent in this country was spent by the military. Total disposable income was 250 billions. "Major national security" expenditures were 52 billions. The current slump was brought on by a reduction of only \$6 billions in military expenditure. What would happen to business if those expenditures were cut in half, or by disarmament eliminated altogether?

Neither Eisenhower nor Stevenson show the slightest readiness to discuss the kind of spending for peaceful reconstruction

at home and abroad which could possibly replace such huge sums. Highways, schools and hospitals—the favorite topics touched on by both parties—would not come anywhere near filling the gap. Judging by the experience of the New Deal, pump-priming for peace would require measures of quite a different order: new TVA's, giant regional quasi-socialist development projects, the clearance not only of urban but of rural slums, the reconstruction of American agriculture, and finally genuine economic planning for the maintenance of employment. This is the spirit in which we ought now to be taking a good look at the enormous expansion of productive capacity which took place under the stimulus of military demand since 1940.

Comfortably Assuming Endless Trouble

On the contrary all the economic studies being made inside the Administration and by the New Dealers outside assume with complacency that world tension will continue for many years and provide a crutch for American business. Whether one looks at the Staff Report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, at the Department of Commerce study of *Markets After the Defense Expansion*, the National Planning Association projection to 1960 or the President's Materials Policy Commission projection to 1975—everywhere one finds assumed a standing army of three to four million men, with annual "defense" expenditures of not less than 40 billion dollars a year. The stability of American capitalism is predicated on the very formula it suspects the Soviet bloc of applying, a policy of neither war, nor peace.

To speak of this as a defense problem is semantic deception. The Democrats talked as if we were dealing with certain fixed amounts of necessary expenditure on which the Republicans were foolishly "skimping." A more accurate figure is that of an international poker game, in which the sky is the limit. The problem has direction and momentum as well as magnitude. Each boost in "defense" on one side forces a similar boost on the other. An arms race is an ascending spiral of expenditure and fear which can end only in war. The Republicans, frightened by the slump, have already given up trying to slow the race down a little. The Democrats would speed it up again. This is the sense in which American business has been made dependent on war; the sense in which American society will slip into war as an easy way out. This is the process we must somehow reverse. How to do so is a challenge to American business enterprise and political leadership which cries out for study, now that the wackiest of all recent election campaigns is over, and sensible discussion may be possible again.

Balance Sheet of An Election Which Failed to Add Up

What Happened? Nobody knows. The President in the final spurt stressed "peace." The Democrats stressed "jobs." There is no reason to believe that either issue was as potent as many of us would like to believe. Neither was that other major issue, the slump in farm prices. Nor the aging Red bogey. How put the Gillette defeat in the farm country, Thurmond's write-in victory in South Carolina, the ALP's low vote in New York, Ferguson's loss in Michigan into any consistent pattern? The fact is that local and State issues and irritations were as or more important than national issues in many areas. Economic distress is obviously not as widespread or important as the Democrats thought, nor peace as vital a concern as Ike's advisers imagined. The election will make little difference, even though as we go to press Neuberger's victory in Oregon promises a Democratic Senate as well as House. On some issues Ike will find a Democratic Congress more amenable than a Republican. The aviation lobby will be happier with its friends, the Democrats, in control of Congress. And Low Blow Joe, almost saved by the squeak through of Case, the one Republican he would not support, will lose his committee chairmanship, i.e. if the Democrats organize the Senate. They seem reluctant to take responsibility, have no real leadership, not much program.

In the House: With the return of the Democrats to control, it is sobering to realize that only one liberal, Celler, will take over a major committee chairmanship, in his case Judiciary. Of the 12 major chairmanships, nine go to Southerners: Howard W. Smith (Va.) of the "Smith Act" becomes chairman of the powerful Rules committee; Barden of North Carolina, whom the labor movement detests, takes over the Labor committee. Barden is to the right of Eisenhower on revision of Taft-Hartley; Smith is to the right of him on practically everything. An item for students of our "two party" system is the shift in the chairmanship of Agriculture, where Cooley of North Carolina will succeed Hope of Kansas. Both opposed Ike's flexible price support program.

Death Knell for the Un-Am? One bright spot on the House horizon lies in the announcement by Walter of Pennsylvania that he will ask for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Since Walter is slated to become chairman of this committee and is one of the most respected and influential conservatives in the House, a move by him to abolish the Committee would have a real chance of passage. Velde's effort as chairman to subpoena Truman was the finish for Democratic members of the committee. Walter's move would not mean the end of the witch hunt in the House. He would shift the search for "subversion" to a subcommittee of Judiciary (like the Senate Internal Security subcommittee of Judiciary). Walter is the single most powerful member of Judiciary; a conservative rather than a reactionary; a man with a deep respect for law which made him an unexpected ally last session in key civil liberties battles, notably against the Butler bill which he almost blocked.

Now the Democrats Will Investigate: Whatever happens to the Un-American Activities Committee, the emphasis in investigations will shift this next session. The Democrats, still smarting from Brownell's attacks on Truman in the Harry White "revelations," are out to dig up the dirt on the

Republicans. The Dixon-Yates power contract is No. 1 on the list; No. 2 is the inquiry launched by Senator Hennings of Missouri into the Brownell-Rover attempt to intimidate Judge Youngdahl in the Lattimore case. No. 3 will be a thorough debunking by House Civil Service of the "numbers game" played by the Republicans, especially Nixon, in juggling security risk discharge figures. Walter touched on this when he told the United Press there was a "strong temptation" to continue the Un-American Activities Committee in order to investigate the Nixon charges "but," he added, "I feel it is more important to abolish the committee." The thought of seeing Nixon grilled by Walter is most engaging.

Liberal Balance Sheet: Pleasant to record are the return of O'Mahoney (Wyo.), Murray (Montana), Kefauver (Tenn.) to the Senate. It is disappointing that Condon was defeated in California and that Glen Taylor did not make it in Idaho. We still hope for Case's election in N. J. and deeply regret John Sherman Cooper's defeat in Kentucky. The Democratic sweep in Pennsylvania brought a promising liberal, George M. Leader, into the Governorship, and in New York, Javits, one of the few genuine liberals in the Republican party showed a vote-getting power for Attorney General that will make the Old Guard sit up and take notice. The idea of having an Attorney General of a party different from the Governor's is an excellent one, as current experience here shows where Brownell is treating the Attorney Generalship as a political rather than a law enforcement office.

Not A Murmur: Government is the big industry of the District of Columbia. Every newspaper in it has a special column devoted to the interests of government employees. Not a newspaper in it but has protested at one time or another some outstanding idiocy or injustice in the security program. Such incidents are innumerable and a constant topic of government gossip. Yet not one newspaper took note of what was for Federal workers the biggest whopperoo of the campaign, Eisenhower's statement at Cleveland October 29, "Throughout the government from top to bottom there has been applied a security program that is tough and thorough, but is absolutely fair. No one man can say that his civil rights have been unjustly damaged through the operation of that security program." The President's ignorance of all factual matters is notorious, but no paper wondered who on his staff would write a script for him containing such an offensive falsehood. Nor did any paper notice that the best Stevenson could say in rejoinder over CBS two nights later was his "me, too" reference to "the orderly search for disloyalty among Federal employees which, listening to the Republicans, you would hardly know was started five years before they came to Washington." The Democrats want to be sure and share the credit!

For New York Readers

Recommended: the series of lectures being given by that grand old timer, Scott Nearing, at the Cornish Arms Hotel, 311 W. 23rd St., each Tuesday night this month, at 6:30 p.m. on the Social Crisis and at 8:30 p.m. on World Events. I can remember the days when Nearing took on Bertrand Russell and Professor Seligman of Columbia in defense of socialism, and he remains as salty, vigorous and independent as ever.

Why Were Owen Lattimore's British Publishers Interrogated?

I hope some member of the British House of Commons will press the Home Secretary for more specific information on the cooperation between the English police and the FBI in the Lattimore case. The written reply given by the new Home Secretary, Major Lloyd George, to the questions in the House October 28 was far from complete.

Major Lloyd George admitted that on two occasions British publishers of books by Lattimore had been questioned at the request of the FBI. The first occasion was in 1952, when a U.S. Embassy representative was allowed to question one British publisher with an English police officer present.

The Home Secretary said the second occasion was last September when New Scotland Yard received a request from the FBI "to obtain certain information" in connection with the prosecution of Lattimore for perjury. A British police officer saw the principal members of two publishing houses and asked for the names of witnesses who could testify as to the number of copies printed in England and the countries in which these copies had been sold. The policeman was informed, according to Major Lloyd George, that neither firm would cooperate.

It was not explained just how information on the number

of copies printed in England and the countries in which sold could possibly have a bearing on a prosecution for perjury in America. The Home Secretary was less informative in discussing the earlier incident. He did not disclose what questions were asked, or what was then the excuse for the interrogation.

In this country, calls of this kind have become familiar. Ex-Communists who decline to "cooperate" with the FBI often find that the refusal has cost them their jobs. An FBI man merely need call on their employer "for information." The employer only has to learn his employee's background and to know that the FBI is watching him to dispense with his services. This is the mechanism that drops the guillotine.

Our embassies abroad are not bashful about trying to interfere with books they do not like. A call from the police might intimidate a publisher. "Ordeal by Slander," Lattimore's own story of his experiences at the hands of McCarthy, was published in England in 1952 by MacGibbon & Kee. It helped to awaken readers abroad to the witch hunt here. Was MacGibbon & Kee by any chance the publisher involved in the 1952 interrogation, and did "Ordeal by Slander" figure in it?

A Serious Setback for the FBI In England

The questions raised in the House about the Lattimore case have already had one good effect. The Home Secretary in his answer of October 28 explained that there was "a standing arrangement whereby the police in this country assist the police of any other friendly country in making inquiries in criminal cases."

Major Lloyd George said that the action taken "in this case was so much regarded as a routine response" that the matter was not brought to the attention of the Home Office. "I have given instructions," he added, "which should ensure that in any comparable case which might arise in future no action will be taken by the police in this country until there has been an opportunity for the matter to be considered at a high level."

This implies that requests for aid from the FBI will no

longer be taken at their face value and automatically responded to. In any "comparable" case, the matter will first be considered "at a high level."

This recalls the Eisler case in 1949 when a London magistrate declined to permit that fugitive's extradition to America. Sir Laurence Dunne ruled "in no circumstances whatever could the offense of which he [Eisler] was convicted in America come under the technical head of perjury in this country."

Actually there is no difference in legal theory between the crime of perjury in England and the crime of perjury in America. The only difference is in the current practice here of using indictments for perjury as vehicles for political persecution. What Sir Laurence Dunne recognized as a magistrate, Major Lloyd George recognizes as England's top administrative official for police matters.

What The British Press Does Not Yet Realize

The British press is exercised over the Lattimore case and welcomed the Home Secretary's statement. *The New Statesman and Nation* of October 30 sees the case as a "Battle for the Soul of America" and says that Attorney General Brownell is "no longer able to distinguish between a court of law and the kangaroo courts of Senators McCarthy and McCarran."

The august London *Times* said in an editorial October 26 that the facts "arouse an uneasy feeling of persecution rather than of prosecution." The *Manchester Guardian* said on October 28: "The British police ought never to have allowed themselves to be used in an American political vendetta."

But the *Manchester Guardian* failed to grasp the full significance of the Lattimore affair when it said "the case has been an exception—a shocking and disgraceful exception—and is far from typical of American procedure."

The Lattimore case is indeed exceptional when looked at against the background of our American past. But when examined against the foreground of recent legislation, it will be seen that this is the exception which threatens to become the rule.

If the courts uphold the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950, especially as amended by the new Anti-Communist Control Law fathered by panicky Democrats last August, the Lattimore case will become the prototype for a new heresy-hunting era.

Lattimore is not accused of perjury for denying some simple fact. He is accused of perjury for denying that he followed Communist party line. The trial of such an issue

must become a contest in casuistry with a jury asked to determine from selected bits and pieces of voluminous writings whether Lattimore was by current American standards a heretic.

If the new laws are upheld, writers like Lattimore who deny that they are Communist party liners need not be tried for perjury where the prosecution is hampered by the traditional safeguards which Anglo-American law provides for those accused of this crime. Writers may be brought to court and convicted more easily for failure to register themselves as Communists, a crime for which the penalty may be as much as five years in jail and a \$10,000 fine.

The importance of the Lattimore case does not lie only in its test of the China Lobby's power to pervert American justice and of Attorney General Brownell's readiness to enlist without scruple in that enterprise.

To read the voluminous documents submitted to Judge Youngdahl on October 28 in support of the motion to dismiss the new indictment is to get a preview of what lies in store for other American liberal and radical writers under the Internal Security Act and its 1954 amendments.

The agonizing task of trying to set the writings of a busy lifetime in the perspective of other times and atmospheres, the humiliating effort to prove that one was not a Communist, the painful task of reconstructing in context the odd bits and pieces torn from one's writings by the prosecution—this will become the fate of a whole generation if the new laws are upheld.

Copies of this issue are being sent to leading British editors and members of Parliament.

Those Ungrateful Germans Already Show Signs of Independence

Adenauer Does A Churchill on Dulles's Very Doorstep

Washington—No less than three times the packed assemblage of newspapermen, advertising agents and lobbyists at the National Press Club gave Adenauer a rising ovation. He was hailed for his "labors day and night in the cause of world peace" and "in the common cause of freedom." He was described as the "iron-willed Chancellor" and compared inevitably to Bismarck, that other iron Chancellor.* Adenauer seemed extraordinarily sturdy for a man of his years. His face is round and flattish, his brow high and fringed with gray, his complexion a pale white, his voice pleasantly soft.

Though fresh from signing a treaty of friendship and commerce with Secretary Dulles, Adenauer went off the reservation. The State Department might have forgiven his statement that Germany had "a special interest" in "normalizing" relations with the Soviet bloc "because only through such normalization can Germany's reunification in peace and freedom be brought about." This was safely vague. But when the Chancellor again spoke, as he has in the past, of a non-aggression pact between the Western and Eastern blocs, the Department let reporters know this did not accord with its views.

In his personal relations with Dulles, Adenauer is as obsequious as only a German can be. But here he was following Churchill, not his American benefactor. Adenauer's proposal for a non-aggression agreement between East and West all but used the hated word "Locarno." Herr Felix von Eckhardt, the West German press chief, tried to repair the damage with a hastily summoned press conference in which he explained lamely that Adenauer had used the word "*abkommen*," a vaguer term for agreement, rather than the stronger words "*vertrag*" or "*pakt*." What difference this made never did become clear. Actually Adenauer used the German words "*vertraglich geregelte Beziehungen*" (relations regulated by agreement) when he spoke of an East-West "relationship which would offer all those participating security against aggression."

The implications, like those of the Churchill Locarno, rankle with Dulles. For they imply that the Russians, too, may have genuine fears about their security which need to be allayed.

* The Germans alone seem to favor "iron" as the material for their statemen.

This does not at all accord with that Manichean vision Dulles nurtures of the Western forces of light combatting the Eastern forces of darkness. In any case he has not yet given up his dream of "liberation" in which the rearmend Germans are cast to play the role of liberators. This he made clear in that interview with C. L. Sulzberger which the *New York Times* printed October 30; all adrip with the Secretary's characteristic and oleaginous religiosity. (One might think he spent his life at Sullivan & Cromwell as a corporation parson, available on hire to open directors' meetings with prayer.) The Secretary indicated he would never, never agree to co-existence under conditions which would leave the Poles and Czechs "enslaved." This implies that he wants the Russians "pushed back" to their old borders. The Germans are to be rearmend to do the pushing.

Adenauer may have other ideas. The one sentence in his address which will mean most at home was: "Korea and Indochina are examples containing a special, unmistakable warning to all Germans." It is not natural sentiment alone which make reunification Germany's first concern. It is the fear of becoming another and bigger Korea. This, and not "liberationism," is the mentality to which Adenauer must address himself. And it is to this mentality that the "Locarno" conception appeals, with its promise of a Germany protected by the U.S. yet at peace with the East. Adenauer this early, in response to inner German political necessities, was already showing himself an unreliable satellite.

The first question asked Adenauer was the No. 1 question of contemporary German politics, and he never did answer it. "Under what conditions short of war," it was put to him, can Russia ever be expected to acquiesce in German unification once West Germany is armed?" This set the Chancellor off into an extraordinarily long, verbose and non-responsive reply, which tailed off weakly into the statement that the problem was "just one part of the world tension today and if the world tension will decrease, and I believe it will decrease some day, then the time will have arrived for the resettlement of the problem of the reunification of Germany." This pie-in-the-sky reply, which was not reported in the American press, will read sourly back home *auf deutsch*.

Please Get Your Renewal in Early and Send A Gift Sub to A Friend

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

11/8/54

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office